hep-th/9503086, EFI-95-11

A Comment on Duality in N=1 Supersymmetric Non-Abelian Gauge Theories

D. Kutasov

Enrico Fermi Institute and
Department of Physics
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637, USA

arXiv:hep-th/9503086v1 13 Mar 1995

Recently N. Seiberg has shown that certain $N = 1$ supersymmetric Yang – Mills theories have the property that their infrared physics can be equivalently described by *two different* gauge theories, with the strong coupling region of one corresponding to the weak coupling region of the other. This duality leads to interesting results about the infrared dynamics of these theories. We generalize Seiberg's ideas to a new class of models for which a similar duality allows one to obtain rather detailed dynamical information about the long distance physics.

3/95

Recently, important progress has been made in analyzing the low energy properties of supersymmetric gauge theories in four dimensions [1-10]. Among the most remarkable is the observation by N. Seiberg [11] that the infrared physics of a large class of Supersymmetric Yang Mills (SYM) theories, with N_f flavors of quarks in the fundamental representation of an $SU(N_c)$, $SO(N_c)$ or $SP(N_c)$ gauge group is identical to that of another SYM theory with an in general different number of colors $\widetilde{N_c}$, but the same number of flavors, N_f, as well as a set of gauge singlet fields. This duality is very useful for studying the long distance properties of these models since it interchanges strong and weak coupling. It has been used in [11] to achieve a detailed understanding of the infrared degrees of freedom of these theories in their non – abelian Coulomb phase. Then, by turning on masses one could also study some aspects of the dynamics in a confining phase [11].

The nature, physical origin and generality of this duality remain, however, largely unclear, and it seems useful to construct some additional examples of this remarkable phenomenon. The purpose of this note is to propose and briefly discuss a class of models that seem to be promising candidates to exhibit a similar duality symmetry. Hopefully, additional examples may shed more light on the dynamics of strongly interacting gauge theories. We start with some general remarks.

The β function of $N = 1$ SYM theories with matter fields Φ_i in representations R_i of a gauge group G is known exactly [3]:

$$\beta(\alpha) = -\frac{\alpha^2}{2\pi}\frac{3T(G) - \sum_i T(R_i)(1-\gamma_i)}{1 - T(G)\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}} \tag{1}$$

where $\alpha = g^2/4\pi$, $\gamma_i(\alpha)$ are the anomalous dimensions of Φ_i, given by:

$$\gamma_i(\alpha) = -C_2(R_i)\frac{\alpha}{\pi} + O(\alpha^2) \tag{2}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_R(T^a T^b) =& T(R)\delta^{ab} \\ T^a T^a =& C_2(R) I \\ T(G) \equiv& T(R = \text{adjoint}). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Non – trivial fixed points can arise if

$$3T(G) - \sum_i T(R_i)(1-\gamma_i) = 0. \tag{4}$$

At the fixed points, γ_i are related to the scaling dimensions of Φ_i through $\gamma_i + 2 = 2d_i$, and the dimensions d_i are related to the R charges of Φ_i, B_i, by the superconformal algebra, $d_i = \frac{3}{2}B_i$. Therefore, we can write (4) as:

$$T(G) + \sum_i T(R_i)(B_i - 1) = 0. \tag{5}$$

Eq. (5) is also the condition for an R symmetry under which the supercoordinates θ_α have charge one and Φ_i have charges B_i to be anomaly free. In general there may be many R symmetries that satisfy (5) and thus are anomaly free. One of these becomes part of the infrared (IR) superconformal algebra. It is interesting (4), (5) that the R symmetry which participates in the IR superconformal algebra is actually an anomaly free symmetry of the theory throughout the RG flow (in the absence of superpotentials).

To study the IR fixed point of SYM it is important to understand which of the symmetries satisfying (5) is the right one. There are some situations in which the answer is known: e.g. if all representations R_i are the same $R_i = R$, $i = 1, \cdots, M$, the R symmetry does not [11] break the symmetry between the different representations, and $B_i = B = 1 - \frac{T(G)}{MT(R)}$. If the fixed point is perturbative [12], i.e. $3T(G) - \sum T(R_i) << T(G)$, the B_i are close to their UV values, $B_i \simeq 2/3 + \alpha\delta_i$ and one can use (2) to compute δ_i. However, in general, it is not clear how to determine B_i (5) to pick the right R charge. Even more importantly, it is not clear in general whether the theory ends up in the infrared in a non – abelian Coulomb phase or not (for examples of the issues involved, see [9], [10]).

We will consider SYM with gauge group $G = SU(N_c)$ and matter superfields X in the adjoint representation of the gauge group, N_f multiplets Q^i in the fundamental (N_c) representation and N_f multiplets $\widetilde{Q}_{\widetilde{i}}$ in the $\bar{N}_c$ ($i, \widetilde{i} = 1, \cdots, N_f$). The theory is asymptotically free for $N_f < 2N_c$. It is natural to assign the same R charge B_f to all the fundamental multiplets Q^i, $\widetilde{Q}_{\widetilde{i}}$, and a different charge B_a to the adjoint, X. The anomaly cancellation condition (5) then takes the form

$$N_f B_f + N_c B_a = N_f \tag{6}$$

and so the issue of which R symmetry becomes part of the superconformal algebra in the infrared arises. As we will see later, duality will allow us to sidestep this ambiguity. The attitude we will take to this model is heavily influenced by [11]. We start by asking whether there could be a dual picture of the dynamics. It is instructive to start the discussion with

the baryons, which in previous studies [11] revealed most directly the form of the duality transformation. In this theory, there are many baryon – like operators of the form[1]

$$B^{[i_1,\cdots,i_k][i_{k+1}\cdots,i_{N_c}]} = \epsilon^{\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{N_c}} X^{\beta_1}_{\alpha_1} X^{\beta_2}_{\alpha_2} \cdots X^{\beta_k}_{\alpha_k} Q^{i_1}_{\beta_1} \cdots Q^{i_k}_{\beta_k} Q^{i_{k+1}}_{\alpha_{k+1}} \cdots Q^{i_{N_c}}_{\alpha_{N_c}} \tag{7}$$

$\alpha_i,\ \beta_j = 1,\cdots,N_c$ are color indices. For given k there are $\binom{N_f}{k}\binom{N_f}{N_c-k}$ operators $B^{[i_1,\cdots,i_k][i_{k+1}\cdots,i_{N_c}]}$, so the total number of baryon operators is

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N_c} \binom{N_f}{k}\binom{N_f}{N_c-k} = \binom{2N_f}{N_c}. \tag{8}$$

Note that only terms with $k \leq N_f$, $N_c - k \leq N_f$ contribute to the sum (8). Hence such operators exist only for $N_f \geq N_c/2$. We will restrict ourselves to this region for the rest of the paper.

We see that the spectrum of baryons may exhibit a symmetry under $N_c \to 2N_f - N_c$ (with N_f fixed). The precise mapping would be

$$B_{\rm el}^{[i_1,\cdots,i_k][i_{k+1}\cdots,i_{N_c}]} \sim B_{\rm mag}^{[j_1,\cdots,j_p][j_{p+1}\cdots,j_{2N_f-N_c}]} \tag{9}$$

with $p = N_f - N_c + k$. We have denoted here the baryons (7) by $B_{\rm el}$ whereas $B_{\rm mag}$ are the baryon operators in the dual ("magnetic") theory discussed below.

Thus one is tempted to attempt to construct a theory dual to the one we are studying, with $N_c \to \widetilde{N}_c = 2N_f - N_c$, such that the baryon operators of the two theories are identified as described by (9). Assuming the existence of such a duality, the identification (9) leads to an additional relation between the R charges B_f and B_a and allows us to fix them (as well as the R charges in the dual theory) unambiguously. One finds:

$$B_a = \frac{2}{3}; \quad B_f = 1 - \frac{2}{3}\frac{N_c}{N_f}. \tag{10}$$

This leads to a puzzle. We find that the R charge of the adjoint multiplet X is the same in the IR fixed point as in the UV one, $B_a = 2/3$. But in (1), (2) we saw that even for perturbative fixed points, i.e. when $2N_c - N_f << N_c$, the dimension (and R charge) of X receives a non – vanishing contribution at first order in α, and therefore is different in the

[1] We will mention additional baryon – like operators below.

IR and in the UV. We believe that the resolution is that the theory under consideration has a non – zero superpotential [2]

$$W_{\rm el}(X) = c{\rm Tr}X^3. \tag{11}$$

Without the superpotential (11), the theory will presumably flow in the infrared to a fixed point with $g = g_0^*$ and $c = 0$, which we will have nothing to say about here. With the superpotential (11) there is a possible additional fixed point in the (g, c) plane at $g = g_1^*$, $c = c^* \neq 0$. Indeed, if one first flows to $g \simeq g_0^*$ at $c = 0$, the operator X^3 becomes relevant and adding it to the action will send the theory to a new (hopefully non – trivial) fixed point. It is this fixed point that is described by (10). Note that the superpotential (11) respects only the R symmetry (10). Therefore, a way of describing what we did is to say that we fixed the ambiguity in determining the R charge present in (6) by adding the superpotential (11) thereby eliminating the other R symmetry. Of course, we actually got (10) by requiring duality, which is independent of the discussion of the superpotential.

To summarize the structure of the original, "electric", model we give the transformation properties of the different operators under the anomaly free global symmetry,

$$SU(N_f) \times SU(N_f) \times U(1)_B \times U(1)_R \tag{12}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q \qquad & (N_f, 1, 1, 1 - \frac{2}{3}\frac{N_c}{N_f}) \\ \widetilde{Q} \qquad & (1, \overline{N}_f, -1, 1 - \frac{2}{3}\frac{N_c}{N_f}) \\ X \qquad & (1, 1, 0, \frac{2}{3}). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We are now ready to describe the dual theory, with gauge group $SU(2N_f - N_c)$. In addition to the dual quarks $q_i, \widetilde{q}^{\widetilde{i}}$ and the adjoint field (which we call Y to distinguish it from X), we have to add to the dual theory two gauge singlet chiral superfields,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\widetilde{i}}^{i} &= Q^i \widetilde{Q}_{\widetilde{i}} \\ N_{\widetilde{i}}^{i} &= Q^i X \widetilde{Q}_{\widetilde{i}} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

which exists in the original theory and can not be described in terms of the dual variables $q, \widetilde{q}, Y$. One does not need to add operators of the form $QX^n\widetilde{Q}$ with $n \geq 2$ because they

[2] For $N_c = 2$ $W(X) = 0$ and the present discussion has to be reconsidered.

do not belong to the chiral ring in the presence of the superpotential[3] (11). The full list of fields in the dual model with their transformation properties under the global symmetry (12) is:

$$\begin{aligned}
q \qquad & (\overline{N}_f, 1, \frac{N_c}{2N_f - N_c}, 1 - \frac{2}{3}\frac{2N_f - N_c}{N_f}) \\
\widetilde{q} \qquad & (1, N_f, -\frac{N_c}{2N_f - N_c}, 1 - \frac{2}{3}\frac{2N_f - N_c}{N_f}) \\
Y \qquad & (1, 1, 0, \frac{2}{3}) \\
M \qquad & (N_f, \overline{N}_f, 0, 2 - \frac{4}{3}\frac{N_c}{N_f}) \\
N \qquad & (N_f, \overline{N}_f, 0, \frac{8}{3} - \frac{4}{3}\frac{N_c}{N_f}).
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Note that all the quantum numbers in (15) are completely determined by duality and the identifications (9), (14).

Again following [11], we note that one can (and should) add in the dual model the superpotential

$$W_{\rm mag} = M^i_{\tilde{i}} q_i Y \widetilde{q}^{\tilde{i}} + N^i_{\tilde{i}} q_i \widetilde{q}^{\tilde{i}} + {\rm Tr} Y^3. \tag{16}$$

It is at first sight surprising to find an operator with UV dimension four appear in (16), especially since one is discussing IR properties of the theory. Nevertheless, we will argue below that the first term in $W_{\rm mag}$ is actually *not* always irrelevant (in both the technical and colloquial sense).

An important test for the duality ansatz is the set of 't Hooft anomaly matching conditions for the global symmetry group (12). Explicit calculation shows that the anomaly matching conditions are satisfied; for both (13) and (15) we find the following anomalies:

$$\begin{aligned}
SU(N_f)^3 \qquad & N_c d^{(3)}(N_f) \\
SU(N_f)^2 U(1)_R \qquad & -\frac{2}{3}\frac{N_c^2}{N_f} d^{(2)}(N_f) \\
SU(N_f)^2 U(1)_B \qquad & N_c d^{(2)}(N_f) \\
U(1)_R \qquad & -\frac{2}{3}(N_c^2 + 1) \\
U(1)_R^3 \qquad & \frac{26}{27}(N_c^2 - 1) - \frac{16}{27}\frac{N_c^4}{N_f^2} \\
U(1)_B^2 U(1)_R \qquad & -\frac{4}{3}N_c^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

[3] The duality discussed here and in [11] is probably restricted to the chiral rings of the two dual models.

Thus, one is inclined to believe that the duality conjecture may indeed be valid. If one accepts this, one learns some interesting things about the theory. Consider first the field $M_{\widetilde{i}}^{i}$ (14), (15). Its scaling dimension (3/2 its R charge) is:

$$\dim M = 3 - \frac{2N_c}{N_f} \tag{18}$$

At $N_f \sim 2N_c$ it is ~ 2 as appropriate for a weakly coupled theory in the original electric variables (14). As N_f decreases, the coupling in the IR electric theory increases and the dimension of M (18) decreases, until at $N_f = N_c$ it becomes one. At that point general arguments [13] suggest that M becomes a free field. It is then natural to expect that the dimension of M in the IR remains one for $N_f < N_c$ as well.

From the point of view of the magnetic theory (15) the behavior of M is rather remarkable. Weak coupling is at $N_f \simeq \frac{2}{3}N_c$, and M is a free field coupled to the gauge sector by a nonrenormalizable superpotential (16). The coefficient of $MqY\widetilde{q}$ in the superpotential decreases as we go to large distances, and perturbatively (i.e. for N_f not much larger than $\frac{2}{3}N_c$) it is clear that in the IR M becomes a free field with dimension one. However, as we increase N_f (and with it the coupling in the magnetic theory) the anomalous dimension of $MqY\widetilde{q}$ may become more and more negative until, if the coupling is strong enough, this irrelevant operator actually becomes relevant and influences the IR dynamics of M and the strongly interacting magnetic gauge degrees of freedom. Clearly, if this occurs it is due to a non – perturbative effect in the magnetic theory, since the IR magnetic gauge coupling must be larger than some critical coupling for the coefficient of $MqY\widetilde{q}$ in the superpotential to become relevant. The original variables (13) can be used to study this magnetic strong coupling effect at weak (electric) coupling.

One may think of the situation as follows[4]: first consider the magnetic theory without the $MqY\widetilde{q}$ and $Nq\widetilde{q}$ terms in $W_{\rm mag}$. The model flows to a fixed point similar to the one described above for the electric theory. The operators q, $\widetilde{q}$, Y have dimensions related to the R charges listed in (15). At the IR fixed point of that theory one may study the operator $MqY\widetilde{q}$. If it is relevant at that point, adding it to the superpotential will take us away from the fixed point to a new one where M is interacting. If it is irrelevant, the added superpotential will not influence the IR dynamics, and M will remain a free field. An easy computation shows that the former occurs exactly when $N_f > N_c$ while the latter happens when $N_f \leq N_c$.

[4] I thank N. Seiberg for a discussion of this point.

A similar discussion holds for the operator N and the related $Nq\widetilde{q}$ interaction. One finds that N should be free when $N_f < \frac{2}{3}N_c$, and interact non – trivially otherwise. Indeed, the operator $N^i_{\widetilde{i}}$ has dimension (15),

$$\dim N = 4 - \frac{2N_c}{N_f} \tag{19}$$

which goes to one at $N_f = \frac{2}{3}N_c$. For $N_f < \frac{2}{3}N_c$ the magnetic gauge theory is not asymptotically free, and hence the full theory is free in the infrared.

The detailed picture of the two dual theories obtained above allows one to study the action of the duality map on other operators as well. As an example, one may look at the baryonic operators[5],

$$C^{[i_1,\cdots,i_k]}_{[j_1,\cdots,j_k]} = \epsilon^{\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{N_c}}\epsilon_{\beta_1,\cdots,\beta_{N_c}} Q^{i_1}_{\alpha_1}\cdots Q^{i_k}_{\alpha_k}\widetilde{Q}^{\beta_1}_{j_1}\cdots\widetilde{Q}^{\beta_k}_{j_k} X^{\beta_{k+1}}_{\alpha_{k+1}}\cdots X^{\beta_{N_c}}_{\alpha_{N_c}}. \tag{20}$$

For given k there are $\binom{N_f}{k}^2$ such operators. Following the same logic as before it is reasonable to assume that duality relates here $Q^k\widetilde{Q}^k X^{N_c-k} \leftrightarrow q^p\widetilde{q}^p Y^{2N_f-N_c-p}$ with $p = N_f - k$. Clearly, there is the same number of both kinds of operators. One can then check using (13), (15) that the global quantum numbers (in particular the R charge and therefore the scaling dimension at the IR fixed point) also agree.

The general structure of this set of theories is thus the following: the theory is free when $N_f > 2N_c$ and when $N_f < \frac{2}{3}N_c$. The former corresponds to free electric variables, with the fields M, N corresponding to quark composites with dimensions two and three, repectively; the latter corresponds to free magnetic variables with M and N being free fields with dimension one. The theory is interacting for $\frac{2}{3}N_c < N_f < 2N_c$. The model with $N_f = N_c$ is self dual under the duality $N_c \to 2N_f - N_c$, which exchanges the region $N_c < N_f < 2N_c$ with $\frac{2}{3}N_c < N_f < N_c$. The field M is free (with dimension one) when $N_f < N_c$ but the full theory is not.

The next step should be to analyze the role of masses and flat directions in the two dual theories. It is not difficult to study the decoupling of quark flavors. Consider e.g. giving a mass to Q^{N_f}, $\widetilde{Q}_{\widetilde{N}_f}$. In the electric variables this leads in the infrared to decoupling of Q^{N_f} and takes the theory from N_f to $N_f - 1$ flavors. In the dual magnetic theory with

[5] I thank A. Schwimmer for suggesting these operators.

gauge group $SU(\widetilde{N}_c = 2N_f - N_c)$ we should find that $\widetilde{N}_c$ decreases by two units as well as $N_f \to N_f - 1$. This can indeed be checked; the superpotential with the mass term is

$$W_{\rm mag} = M^i_{\widetilde{i}} q_i Y \widetilde{q}^{\widetilde{i}} + N^i_{\widetilde{i}} \widetilde{q}^{\widetilde{i}} q_i + m M^{N_f}_{\widetilde{N}_f} + cY^3. \tag{21}$$

We can integrate out the massive fields, whose equations of motion lead (among other things) to:

$$\begin{aligned} q_{N_f} Y \widetilde{q}^{\widetilde{N}_f} &= -m \\ q_{N_f} \widetilde{q}^{\widetilde{N}_f} &= 0 \\ q_i \widetilde{q}^{\widetilde{N}_f} &= 0 \\ q_{N_f} \widetilde{q}^{\widetilde{i}} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

This means that the gauge group is broken to $SU(2N_f - N_c - 2)$ and the number of flavors decreases by one, the correct answer. Note that here too it was important to keep the nonrenormalizable first term in the superpotential (21) to get the right structure as masses are turned on. As in [11], adding the mass term to the Lagrangian of the electric theory makes it more strongly interacting and eventually confining. In the dual magnetic variables it corresponds (22) to Higgsing the gauge group and thus makes the theory more weakly coupled.

To conclude, we have seen again the power and beauty of the duality of [11]; very few qualitative assumptions led us to a rather detailed, and non – trivial to independently verify quantitative picture of the infrared dynamics of a large class of strongly interacting supersymmetric gauge theories. Many questions remain. One would like to understand what (if any) non – perturbative superpotential the theory can generate, along the lines of [6]. It is important to understand the structure of the moduli space of vacua (flat directions) and the relation to the $N = 2$ SYM models of [8], study the dynamics for $N_f \leq \frac{N_c}{2} + 1$, $N_c = 2$, and try to generalize to other fixed points of this theory and to other gauge groups. More ambitiously, one would like to develop a general framework for treating supersymmetric gauge theories that makes duality manifest. For this it would be useful to find additional examples of theories exhibiting similar symmetries. All these and other issues are left for future work.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank J. Harvey, E. Martinec, A. Schwimmer and N. Seiberg for discussions. This work was supported in part by a DOE OJI award.

References

[1] I. Affleck, M. Dine, and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. **B241** (1984) 493; Nucl. Phys. **B256** (1985) 557

[2] V.A. Novikov, M.A. Shifman, A. I. Vainstein and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B223** (1983) 445; Nucl. Phys. **B260** (1985) 157; Nucl. Phys. **B229** (1983) 381

[3] M.A. Shifman and A.I Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. **B277** (1986) 456; Nucl. Phys. **B359** (1991) 571

[4] D. Amati, K. Konishi, Y. Meurice, G.C. Rossi and G. Veneziano, Phys. Rep. **162** (1988) 169 and references therein

[5] N. Seiberg, hep-ph/9309335, Phys. Lett. **318B** (1993) 469

[6] N. Seiberg, hep-th/9402044, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 6857

[7] K. Intriligator, R.G. Leigh and N. Seiberg, hep-th/9403198, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 1092

[8] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, hep-th/9407087, Nucl. Phys. **B426** (1994) 19; hep-th/9408099, Nucl. Phys. **B431** (1994) 484

[9] K. Intriligator and N. Seiberg, hep-th/9408155, Nucl. Phys. **B431** (1994) 551

[10] K. Intriligator, N. Seiberg and S. Shenker, hep-ph/9410203, Phys. Lett. **342B** (1995) 152

[11] N. Seiberg, hep-th/9411149, Nucl. Phys. **B435** (1995) 129

[12] T. Banks and A. Zaks, Nucl. Phys. **B196** (1982) 189

[13] G. Mack, Comm. Math. Phys. **55** (1977) 1